



Faculty of Electrical Engineering

**SINGLE INPUT FUZZY LOGIC CONTROLLER FOR YAW
CONTROL OF UNDERWATER REMOTELY OPERATED
CRAWLER**

Muhammad Iktisyam bin Mohd Zainal

Master of Science in Mechatronic Engineering

2018

**SINGLE INPUT FUZZY LOGIC CONTROLLER FOR YAW
CONTROL OF UNDERWATER REMOTELY OPERATED CRAWLER**

MUHAMMAD IKTISYAM BIN MOHD ZAINAL

**A thesis submitted
in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Mechatronic
Engineering**

Faculty of Electrical Engineering

UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA

2018

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis entitled “Single Input Fuzzy Logic Controller for Yaw Control of Underwater Remotely Operated Crawler” is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

Signature :

Name : Muhammad Iktisyam bin Mohd Zainal

Date :

APPROVAL

I hereby declare that I have read this thesis and in my opinion this thesis is sufficient in terms of scope and quality for the award of Master of Science in Mechatronic Engineering.

Signature :

Supervisor Name : Dr. Mohd Shahrieel bin Mohd Aras

Date :

DEDICATION

To my beloved mother and father

ABSTRACT

Underwater Remotely Operated Crawler (ROC) is a class of the Unmanned Underwater Vehicle (UUV) that is tethered, unoccupied, manoeuvres on the seabed and remotely operated by a pilot from a platform. Underwater characteristic parameters such as added mass, buoyancy, hydrodynamic forces, underwater currents, including pressure could considerably affect and reduce the mobility of the ROC. The challenges faced by the ROCs are that the needs to reduce the overshoot in the system response, including, the time response and settling time. For yaw control (a motion around the *z-axis*), an occurrence of an overshoot in the system response is highly intolerable. Reducing the overshoot in the ROC trajectory is crucial since there are many challenging underwater natures and underwater vehicle control problems while studies on finding the solutions are still ongoing to find an improvement. Conventional Proportional-Integral-Derivative (PID) controller is not robust to be applied in the ROC due to the non-linear dynamic model of the ROC and underwater conditions. Besides that, by reducing the overshoot, the ROC mobility will be much more efficient and provided a reliable platform for underwater data mining. This study is focused to give an optimum performance of yaw control without overshoot in the system response and faster time response. This research begins by designing an underwater ROC as the research's platform. Then, the designed ROC is simulated by using SolidWorks software obtain the analysis of structural integrity and hydrodynamic properties. System identification technique is conducted to obtain the empirical modelling design of the fabricated ROC which equipped with Inertial Measurement Unit (IMU) sensor. The fuzzy logic controller (FLC) is designed based on 5 by 5 rule matrix which has to deal with fuzzification, rule base, inference mechanism and defuzzification operations. A simplification of the FLC is proposed and the method is called Single Input Fuzzy Logic Controller (SIFLC). The simplification is achieved by applying the "signed distance method" where the SIFLC reduces the two-input FLC to a single input FLC. In other words, SIFLC is based on the signed distance method which eventually reduces the controller as single input-single output (SISO) controller. A PID controller is designed for the purpose of benchmarking with the FLC and SIFLC. SIFLC has the capability to adapt the non-linear underwater parameters (currents, waves and etc.). This research has discussed and compared the performance of PID, FLC and SIFLC. The algorithm is verified in MATLAB/Simulink software. Based on the results, SIFLC provides more robust and reliable control system. Based on the computation results, SIFLC reduces the percentage of overshoot (%OS) of the system and achieve 0.121%, while other controllers (PID and FLC) 4.4% and 1.7% respectively. Even that so, this does not mean that PID and FLC are not reliable but due to the presence of %OS.

ABSTRAK

Perangkak Kawalan Jauh (ROC) merupakan satu kelas Kenderaan Dasar Laut Tanpa Pemandu (UUV) yang terikat dengan kabel, tanpa pemandu, beroperasi di dasar laut dan dikawal oleh seseorang dari platform permukaan. Ciri dalam air seperti penambahan jisim, daya apung, daya hidrodinamik, arus dasar laut serta tekanan boleh menjejaskan dan membataskan pergerakan ROC. Cabaran dihadapi ROC adalah keperluan mengurangkan peratusan terlajak dalam tindak balas sistem kawalan termasuk masa tindak balas dan masa penetapan. Untuk kawalan rewang (pergerakan sekitar paksi z), tindak balas lajak adalah sangat tidak boleh diterima. Mengurangkan lanjakkan dalam trajektori ROC adalah penting kerana terdapat banyak cabaran dalam masalah kawalan kenderaan bawah air dan penyelidikan kepada mencari penyelesaian masih lagi dijalankan. Sistem kawalan Terbitan-Berkadar-Terus (PID) tidak dapat digunakan kepada ROC disebabkan model ROC tidak berkadar terus serta keadaan dasar laut. Selain itu, dengan mengurangkan lajakkan, pergerakan ROC akan menjadi lebih cekap dan menyediakan sebuah platform yang boleh dipercayai untuk pengumpulan data di bawah air. Kajian ini memfokuskan untuk menghasilkan keupayaan yang optima tanpa lajakan dalam tindak balas system dan tindak balas masa yang cepat. Kajian ini dimulakan dengan mereka perangkak dalam air kawalan jauh sebagai barang kaji. Kemudian, rekaan ROC disimulasikan menggunakan perisian SolidWorks untuk mendapatkan analisa struktur dan ciri hidrodinamik. Teknik pengenalan system digunakan untuk mendapatkan model empirikal ROC yang dilengkapi dengan sensor IMU. Pengawal Logik Samar (FLC) direka berdasarkan matrik 5 kali 5 yang memerlukan proses pengkaburan, dasar syarat, mekanisma kesimpulan dan pengkaburan. Pengawal pintar satu input diperkenalkan dan kaedah ini dipanggil Satu Input Pengawal Logik Samar (SIFLC). Pemudahan dihasilkan dengan menggunakan kaedah jarak ditandakan iaitu SIFLC mengurangkan dua input FLC kepada satu input FLC. Dalam kata lain, SIFLC ialah berdasarkan kaedah jarak ditandakan yang akhirnya mengurangkan input pengawal iaitu Satu Input Satu pengeluaran. Pengawal PID dihasilkan bagi tujuan penanda aras kepada FLC dan SIFLC. SIFLC berupaya untuk menyesuaikan parameter tidak berkadar terus (arus, ombak dan sebagainya). Kajian ini membincangkan dan membandingkan keupayaan PID, FLC dan SIFLC. Algoritma ini disahkan menggunakan perisian MATLAB/Simulink. Berdasarkan keputusan simulasi, SIFLC mengurangkan peratusan lajakan (%OS) system dan mencapai 0.121% manakala (PID dan FLC) masing-masing 4.4% dan 1.7%. Namun demikian, ini tidak bermakna PID dan FLC tidak dapat diharapkan kerana kewujudan %OS.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere acknowledgement to my supervisor Dr. Mohd Shahrieel bin Mohd Aras from the Faculty of Electrical Engineering Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka (UTeM) for his essential supervision, support and encouragement towards the completion of this thesis.

I would also like to express my greatest gratitude to Dr. Muhammad Nizam bin Kamarudin from the Faculty of Electrical Engineering, co-supervisor of this project for his advice and suggestions in writing this thesis.

Special thanks to all my peers and my parents for their moral support in completing this degree. Lastly, thank you to everyone who had been to the crucial parts of realization of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|-------------|
| DECLARATION | |
| APPROVAL | |
| DEDICATION | |
| ABSTRACT | i |
| ABSTRAK | ii |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | iii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | iv |
| LIST OF TABLES | vii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | ix |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | xii |
| LIST OF SYMBOLS | xiii |
| LIST OF PUBLICATIONS | xiv |
| | |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Motivation | 5 |
| 1.2.1 Human Factors: Mishaps in Underwater Vehicle System | 6 |
| 1.2.2 Underwater Environments | 6 |
| 1.3 Problem Statements | 8 |
| 1.4 Objectives | 12 |
| 1.5 Scopes of Work | 12 |
| 1.6 Significant of Study | 13 |
| 1.7 Contributions of the Research | 13 |
| 1.8 Thesis Outline | 14 |
| | |
| 2. LITERATURE REVIEW | 16 |
| 2.1 Introduction to Unmanned Underwater Vehicle | 16 |
| 2.2 Design and Development of Remotely Operated Crawler (ROC) | 20 |
| 2.2.1 Characteristic of the ROC | 21 |
| 2.2.1.1 Material Selections | 22 |
| 2.2.1.2 ROC Mobility System | 24 |
| 2.3 Navigation and Trajectory Strategies of Unmanned Underwater Vehicles | 26 |
| 2.4 Modelling of Unmanned Underwater Vehicle System | 27 |
| 2.4.1 Linear and Non-Linear Feedback | 29 |
| 2.4.1.1 Linear Methods Approach | 29 |
| 2.4.1.2 Non-Linear Methods Approach | 30 |
| 2.4.2 System Identification Technique | 31 |
| 2.5 The existing control strategies for Unmanned Underwater Vehicle | 33 |
| 2.5.1 Proportional Integral Derivative | 34 |
| 2.5.2 Sliding Mode | 35 |
| 2.5.3 Model Predictive Control | 37 |
| 2.5.4 Artificial Neural Network | 38 |
| 2.5.5 Fuzzy Logic Controller | 40 |
| 2.6 Improvement in Fuzzy Logic Controller | 42 |
| 2.6.1 Single Input Fuzzy Logic Controller | 42 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----------|
| 2.6.2 | Adaptive Fuzzy Logic Controller | 47 |
| 2.7 | Summary | 50 |
| 3. | RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | 52 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 52 |
| 3.2 | Overall Research Execution | 53 |
| 3.3 | The Remotely Operated Crawler | 57 |
| 3.3.1 | Designing the Remotely Operated Crawler | 58 |
| 3.3.2 | Simulation of the ROC | 60 |
| 3.3.3 | Simulation Setup | 62 |
| 3.3.3.1 | SimulationXpress | 63 |
| 3.3.3.2 | FloXpress | 64 |
| 3.4 | Modelling Process of Motion of the Remotely Operated Crawler | 66 |
| 3.4.1 | Experimental Approach | 67 |
| 3.4.2 | Integrated Sensor/IMU | 69 |
| 3.4.3 | Microbox 2000/2000C | 71 |
| 3.4.4 | Simulation Setup | 73 |
| 3.5 | Conventional Tuning Mechanisms in Motion Control | 76 |
| 3.5.1 | Manual Tuning | 76 |
| 3.5.2 | Heuristic Approach | 77 |
| 3.5.3 | Auto Tune | 77 |
| 3.6 | Motion Control in Underwater Vehicles | 78 |
| 3.6.1 | PID Controller | 80 |
| 3.6.2 | Fuzzy Logic Controller for ROC Yaw-Control | 81 |
| 3.6.3 | Single Input Fuzzy Logic Controller for ROC Yaw-Control | 87 |
| 3.6.4 | An Improved Single Input Fuzzy Logic Controller | 91 |
| 3.7 | Summary | 92 |
| 4. | RESULT AND DISCUSSION | 94 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 94 |
| 4.2 | Simulations and Field Tests of the ROC | 95 |
| 4.2.1 | Simulation of the ROC's Structure | 96 |
| 4.2.2 | Simulation: Flow of Fluid Around ROC | 103 |
| 4.2.3 | Field Tests | 118 |
| 4.2.3.1 | Waterproof Test | 118 |
| 4.2.3.2 | Buoyancy Test | 121 |
| 4.2.3.3 | Control and Maneuverability Test | 123 |
| 4.2.3.4 | Control and Maneuverability Test (Underwater Field Test) | 126 |
| 4.3 | Modelling of the ROC | 129 |
| 4.3.1 | ROC Trajectory Modelling Experiment | 129 |
| 4.3.2 | Modelling via System Identification Technique | 132 |
| 4.4 | Conventional PID Controller | 136 |
| 4.4.1 | Implementation of PID on ROC Control System for Path Following | 136 |
| 4.4.2 | Parameters Setting for PID Controller | 136 |
| 4.4.3 | Results: PID Simulations | 138 |
| 4.4.3.1 | PID Without Tuning | 139 |
| 4.4.3.2 | PID1 with Tuned Parameters | 141 |
| 4.4.3.3 | PID2 with Tuned Parameters | 143 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 4.4.3.4 | PID3 with Tuned Parameters | 145 |
| 4.4.3.5 | PID4 with Tuned Parameters | 146 |
| 4.4.4 | Simulations Discussion | 148 |
| 4.5 | Implementation FLC for Yaw Control | 149 |
| 4.5.1 | Designing the FLC | 150 |
| 4.5.2 | Effects of Tuning with Different Scale in the FLC | 153 |
| 4.5.2.1 | Response of FLC1 | 153 |
| 4.5.2.2 | Response of FLC2 | 157 |
| 4.5.3 | Simulations Discussion | 161 |
| 4.6 | An Improved Single Input Fuzzy Logic Controller | 162 |
| 4.6.1 | SIFLC with Step Input | 163 |
| 4.6.2 | SIFLC with Multiple Step Input | 167 |
| 4.6.3 | Simulations Discussion | 169 |
| 4.7 | Comparison of PID, CFLC and SIFLC | 170 |
| 4.8 | Summary | 175 |
| 5. | CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 176 |
| 5.1 | Conclusion | 176 |
| 5.2 | Recommendations | 178 |
| | REFERENCES | 179 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | TITLE | PAGE |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| 2.1 | Rule Table | 44 |
| 2.2 | The Reduced Rule Table Of SIFLC | 46 |
| 3.1 | The Specification of the ROC | 59 |
| 3.2 | Mesh Information Parameters | 64 |
| 3.3 | General Info on the Simulation's Parameters | 65 |
| 3.4 | Ambient Conditions | 66 |
| 3.5 | Control Variables | 67 |
| 3.6 | The Connection to Microbox | 73 |
| 3.7 | Notation in Marine Vehicles | 78 |
| 3.8 | Rule Table for ROC | 86 |
| 3.9 | Fuzzy Rule Table with Toepolitz Structure | 87 |
| 3.10 | Rule Table of the Reduced Rules | 89 |
| 4.1 | Model Information | 97 |
| 4.2 | Material Properties | 98 |
| 4.3 | Fixtures | 98 |
| 4.4 | Loads | 99 |
| 4.5 | Mesh Information | 99 |
| 4.6 | Mesh Information – Details | 100 |
| 4.7 | Stress Results | 101 |
| 4.8 | Displacement Results | 102 |
| 4.9 | Deformation Results | 103 |
| 4.10 | General Info on the Simulation | 104 |
| 4.11 | Size of the Computational Domain | 105 |
| 4.12 | Boundary Conditions | 105 |
| 4.13 | Ambient Conditions | 106 |
| 4.14 | GG Av Velocity (X) 1 | 107 |
| 4.15 | GG Av Velocity | 107 |
| 4.16 | GG Av Velocity (X) 2 | 108 |
| 4.17 | Calculation Control Options | 108 |
| 4.18 | Basic Mesh Dimensions | 109 |
| 4.19 | Number of Cells | 109 |
| 4.20 | Goals | 110 |
| 4.21 | Min/Max Table | 110 |
| 4.22 | Waterproof Test (Test 1) | 120 |
| 4.23 | Waterproof Test (Test 2) | 121 |
| 4.24 | Results of the Buoyant Test | 122 |
| 4.25 | The Time Taken for the ROC to Crawl in a Distance Of 3 meters | 123 |
| 4.26 | Table for the ROC to Crawl Over Wooden Platform | 125 |
| 4.27 | ROC Underwater Movement | 126 |
| 4.28 | Table for the ROC to Crawl Over Underwater Obstacles | 128 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.29 | Parameters Simulated | 130 |
| 4.30 | Parameters Changes | 137 |
| 4.31 | Parameters of PID | 139 |
| 4.32 | Parameters of PID1 | 141 |
| 4.33 | Parameters of PID2 | 143 |
| 4.34 | Parameters of PID3 | 145 |
| 4.35 | Parameters of PID4 | 146 |
| 4.36 | Comparison Table Between PID Parameters | 149 |
| 4.37 | Rule Table for ROC | 153 |
| 4.38 | Parameters of the FLC1 | 154 |
| 4.39 | Parameters of the FLC2 | 157 |
| 4.40 | Performance of FLC1 and FLC2 | 161 |
| 4.41 | Rule Table with Toepolitz Structure | 162 |
| 4.42 | The Reduced SIFLC Rule Table | 163 |
| 4.43 | System Performance of the ROC-Yaw Control | 165 |
| 4.44 | System Performance of Yaw Control Reduced Gain | 167 |
| 4.45 | System Performance of Yaw Control | 169 |
| 4.46 | Comparisons between SIFLC and SIFLC2 with the Gain Changes | 169 |
| 4.47 | The Results of Different Controller | 172 |
| 4.48 | The Results of Different Controller with Multi-Step | 175 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE | TITLE | PAGE |
|--------|---|------|
| 1.1 | Types of Underwater Vehicles | 4 |
| 1.2 | Ocean Circulation Waves, Tide and Current Topography | 8 |
| 1.3 | Coordinate systems and Body Fixed Diagram | 10 |
| 1.4 | The Trajectory of a ROC | 11 |
| 2.1 | Classification of Unmanned Underwater Vehicles | 18 |
| 2.2 | RG-II- The Underwater Recovery ROC | 19 |
| 2.3 | Tethered ROC with Surface Vessel | 20 |
| 2.4 | RG-III Crawler Design in CAD Software | 22 |
| 2.5 | USS Vehicle | 23 |
| 2.6 | Schematic of A Flipper Type ROC System | 25 |
| 2.7 | Block Diagram of Neural Network Predictive Control System | 40 |
| 2.8 | Block Diagram of State-Feedback Gain Compensator Coupled With FLC | 41 |
| 2.9 | Derivation of Distance Variable | 45 |
| 2.10 | The Control Structure of SIFLC | 46 |
| 3.1 | Project Flowchart | 56 |
| 3.2 | The Remotely Operated Crawler | 57 |
| 3.3 | Assembly Design of the Crawler | 58 |
| 3.4 | Side View of the ROC | 60 |
| 3.5 | The Chassis of the ROC | 62 |
| 3.6 | Points of External Forces | 63 |
| 3.7 | Coordinate System of the ROC | 68 |
| 3.8 | The Set Points of the ROC | 69 |
| 3.9 | Microbox 2000/2000C | 72 |
| 3.10 | General Process of Modelling the ROC | 74 |
| 3.11 | System Identification Interface | 75 |
| 3.12 | Example of the Model Order Selection | 75 |
| 3.13 | Measure and Simulated Model Output | 76 |
| 3.14 | The Block Diagram of the ROC Control System | 79 |
| 3.15 | Simulink of PID to ROC-Yaw Control | 80 |
| 3.16 | Elements of FLC | 81 |
| 3.17 | Actuator Control System | 82 |
| 3.18 | Simulink of FLC for ROC-Yaw System | 83 |
| 3.19 | The Membership Function for Input (Error) | 84 |
| 3.20 | The Membership Function for Input (Change Of Error) | 85 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 3.21 | The Membership Function for Output (Yaw Output) | 86 |
| 3.22 | Derivation of Distance, d | 88 |
| 3.23 | The Structure of SIFLC | 90 |
| 3.24 | Adaptive Fuzzy Logic Controller | 92 |
| 4.1 | Graph of Density vs Temperature of Water | 111 |
| 4.2 | Graph of Dynamic Viscosity Vs Temperature of Water | 112 |
| 4.3 | Graph of Specific Heat Capacity Vs Temperature of Water | 113 |
| 4.4 | Graph of Thermal Conductivity Vs Temperature of Water | 114 |
| 4.5 | Left View of The Flow Test | 116 |
| 4.6 | Right View of The Flow Test | 116 |
| 4.7 | Top View of The Flow Test | 117 |
| 4.8 | 3D View of The Flow Test | 117 |
| 4.9 | Chassis is Submersed to Identify Any Leaking | 119 |
| 4.10 | The ROC is Sealed and Tested for Leakage | 120 |
| 4.11 | Iron Column is Added to Overcome the Buoyant Force | 122 |
| 4.12 | The Ability of the ROC to Climb Chart | 124 |
| 4.13 | The ROC Climbed the Obstacles | 125 |
| 4.14 | Underwater Obstacles Test | 127 |
| 4.15 | ROC Underwater Movement Results | 128 |
| 4.16 | Trajectory Path Plan | 130 |
| 4.17 | Laboratory Experimental Result | 131 |
| 4.18 | Time Taken for the ROC to Complete the Path | 132 |
| 4.19 | Measured and Simulated Model Output | 133 |
| 4.20 | Transfer Function Block Diagram | 134 |
| 4.21 | The Input for the Open-Loop | 134 |
| 4.22 | The Output of the Open-Loop | 135 |
| 4.23 | PID Simulink Block Diagram | 137 |
| 4.24 | PID Controller Without Parameters Tuning | 140 |
| 4.25 | PID1 Controller Output Response with Tuned Parameters | 142 |
| 4.26 | PID2 Controller Response with the Changes of Parameters | 144 |
| 4.27 | PID3 Controller Response with the Changes of Parameters | 146 |
| 4.28 | PID4 Controller Response with the Changes of Parameters | 147 |
| 4.29 | FLC Block Diagram Design | 150 |
| 4.30 | The Membership Function Input Error (Yaw) | 151 |
| 4.31 | The Membership Function Input Data Error (Velocity Around Z-Axis) | 151 |
| 4.32 | The Membership Function Output Error | 152 |
| 4.33 | The Membership Function Input Error (Yaw) of FLC1 | 154 |
| 4.34 | The Membership Function Input Data Error (Velocity Around Z-Axis) of FLC1 | 155 |
| 4.35 | The Membership Function Output Error of FLC1 | 155 |
| 4.36 | The Output Response of FLC1 | 156 |
| 4.37 | The Membership Function Input Error (Yaw) of FLC2 | 158 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.38 | The Membership Function Input Data Error (Velocity Around Z-Axis) of FLC2 | 158 |
| 4.39 | The Membership Function Output Error of FLC2 | 159 |
| 4.40 | The Output Response of FLC2 | 160 |
| 4.41 | SIFLC Block Diagram | 163 |
| 4.42 | SIFLC Output Response | 164 |
| 4.43 | SIFLC Output Response Gain Tuned | 166 |
| 4.44 | SIFLC Block Diagram with Multiple Step Input | 167 |
| 4.45 | SIFLC Output Response with Multiple Step Input | 168 |
| 4.46 | Simulink Block Diagram of PID, FLC and SIFLC | 170 |
| 4.47 | Comparison of PID, FLC and SIFLC for ROC-Yaw Control | 171 |
| 4.48 | Simulink Block Diagram of PID, FLC and SIFLC with Multi-Step Input | 173 |
| 4.49 | ROC Position with Multi-Step Implemented with PID, FLC and SIFLC | 174 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|-------|---|---|
| ADCP | - | Acoustic Doppler Current Profiler |
| AFLC | - | Adaptive Fuzzy Logic Controller |
| ANFIS | - | Adaptive Neuro-Fuzzy Inference Systems |
| ASFLC | - | Adaptive Simplified Fuzzy Logic Controller |
| AUV | - | Autonomous Underwater Vehicle |
| CFLC | - | Conventional Fuzzy Logic Controller |
| CFRP | - | Carbon Fibre Reinforced Plastic |
| DOF | - | Degree of Freedom |
| DVL | - | Doppler Velocity Log |
| FLC | - | Fuzzy Logic Controller |
| GDROV | - | General Detection Remotely Operated Vehicle |
| GPS | - | Global Positioning System |
| HOSM | - | Higher Order Sliding Mode |
| HOV | - | Human Occupied Vehicle |
| HROV | - | Hybrid Remotely Operated Vehicle |
| IMU | - | Inertial Measurement Unit |
| INS | - | Inertial Navigation System |
| LQG | - | Linear-Quadratic-Gaussian |
| MPC | - | Model Predictive Control |
| NL | - | Negative Large |
| NM | - | Negative Medium |
| NNPC | - | Neural Network Predictive Control |
| NS | - | Negative Small |
| PID | - | Proportional-Integral-Derivative |
| PL | - | Positive Large |
| PM | - | Positive Medium |
| PS | - | Positive Small |
| PSO | - | Particle Swarm Optimization |
| ROC | - | Remotely Operated Crawler |
| ROV | - | Remotely Operated Vehicle |
| SAR | - | Search and Rescue |
| SCF | - | Super Carbon Fibre |

LIST OF SYMBOLS

| | | |
|-----------|---|-------------------------------|
| $\%OS$ | - | Percentage of overshoot |
| λ | - | Slope of zero diagonal line |
| θ | - | Angle between vehicle heading |
| d | - | Distance |
| \dot{e} | - | Change of error |
| e | - | Error |
| k | - | Gain |
| L_{NL} | - | Line of negative large |
| L_{NM} | - | Line of negative medium |
| L_{NS} | - | Line of negative small |
| L_{PL} | - | Line of positive large |
| L_{PM} | - | Line of negative medium |
| L_{PS} | - | Line of negative small |
| L_Z | - | Line of zero |
| r | - | Output factor |
| u_0 | - | Change of control output |

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

1. Nor Azmi, M., M. Aras, M., Zainal, I., Kamarudin, M., M. Zambri, M. and Harun, M. (2017). Gearing System Analysis for Underwater Remotely Operated Crawler (ROC). In: National Technical Seminar on Underwater System Technology (NUSYS) 2017. pp.35-38.
2. Aras, M.S.M., Kamarudin, M.N., Zainal, I., Aziri, H., Zambri, M.K.M., Ab Rashid, M.Z. and Shah, H.N.M., 2016, December. Analysis of integrated sensors for unmanned underwater vehicle application. In Underwater System Technology: Theory and Applications (USYS), IEEE International Conference on (pp. 224-229). IEEE.
3. Aras, M.S.M., Kamarudin, M.N., Rusli, M.H.B.C. and Zainal, M.I.M., 2016. Small Scale Unmanned Underwater Remotely Operated Crawler (ROC). Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, 3(3), pp.481-488.
4. Shahrieel, M., Aras, M., Muhammad Nizam, K., Hanif, M., Rusli, C., Iktisyam, M. and Zainal, M., 2016. Small Scale Unmanned Underwater Remotely Operated Crawler (ROC). TELKOMNIKA Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering, 3(3), pp.1-8.
5. Zainal, I., Shahrieel, M., Aras, M., Muhammad Nizam, K., Harun, M.H., Khairi, M., Zambri, M., Alias, K. and Anuar, M.K., 2016. Design Process and Hydrodynamic Analysis of Underwater Remotely Operated Crawler. Journal of Telecommunication, Electronic and Computer Engineering (JTEC), pp.35-39.
6. Aras, M.S.M., Zainal, I., Abdullah, S.S., Kassim, A.M. and Jaafar, H.I., 2015. Development of an Unmanned Underwater Remotely Operated Crawler (ROC) For Monitoring Application. Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology (JMET), 7(2).

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is an introduction to the project that covers briefly about the research background. The motivation and significance of the research are also included in this chapter. Other significant contents are also being determined such as motivation, problem statements, objectives, scopes and report outlines of this research. Each stated content is explained in detail as an execution of the report outline.

1.1 Introduction

Ocean exploration technologies have been developed over the last few decades and capable of meeting many challenges impose during the exploration. The technologies available today includes platforms such as vessels and submersibles, observing systems and sensors, communication technologies and diving technologies (Oceanexplorer, 2014a). By having all these technologies, humans can explore the underwater environment, searching for new specimens, scientific research, oil exploration, hull inspections or even for search and rescue (SAR) operation. Discoveries that are made through ocean exploration are important to reduce the unknowns in the ocean areas. Besides that, an underwater exploration provides a high-value environmental intelligence needed to address both science and management needs. Exploration helps to ensure that ocean resources are well managed for

future generations. The knowledge from underwater exploration is often the only source for basic information needed to respond appropriately in the face of deep-sea disasters (Oceanexplorer, 2014b).

Underwater vehicles are among of the technology often used in ocean exploration. This kind of technology increasingly sophisticated and more advanced than decades ago. The current technologies have removed the need for pilots to be in the vessels and dive into the deep water. This will reduce the risk taken for a man as the need for deeper and further underwater exploration. Smaller and versatile design of underwater vehicles could be made since there is no space needed for the man inside the vessel. As the human is removed from the advancing systems, the critical constraints are removed and yet poses the problem of guaranteeing the vehicle's effective capabilities, performing tasks, structure integrity and controlling system including its autonomy.

There are various types of underwater vehicles available today. These submersibles can be classified into few types which are; Human Occupied Vehicle (HOV), Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV), Autonomous Underwater Vehicle (AUV) and Hybrid Remotely Operated Vehicle (HROV) (Ocean Portal | Smithsonian, 2016) as shown in Figure 1.1. The HOV is a vessel or submarine that carries men or scientists themselves to the deep ocean in order to investigate first-hand the environments and specimens there while ROVs and AUVs are the unmanned craft that let explorers observe and study those places they cannot dive. ROVs are remotely controlled through a cable which connects to the operator on the land or surface platform, limiting their mobility. ROV either in the shape of a submarine or as Remotely Operated Crawler (ROC). New developments in automation led to the creation of AUVs. This type of underwater technology eliminates pilots or operators since the robotic submarines are programmed in advance and do not receive any instruction from the surface.

The latest technology developed is the HROV which is the combination of ROV with AUV, or ROV with ROC. HROV can operate independently with or without a pilot.

As technology continues to advance in the ROV industry, the increasing need for a robust controller becomes apparent. The field of research is focusing on one of the types of ROV which is a specific discussion on the design and development of the controller for a ROC. Figure 1.1 (e) shows the Remotely Operated Sea Crawler (Project ROSCo) developed at Florida Tech. ROSCo is the new underwater vehicle concept with the ability to take a wide range of underwater excavation projects (Florida Tech eCurrent, 2017). The ROC will become the platform of the research on designing an Improved Single Input Fuzzy Logic Controller (SIFLC) for the yaw motion of the vehicle. Previously, the use of underwater crawler is quite unpopular than the submarine type ROV. So, it is important to design and build a ROC that fits into any field. The significance of this study is to target a wide area of usage for the ROC such as the ROC can be used in archaeology, seabed monitoring for earthquakes, search and rescue, offshore maintenance and even military purposes. The ROC will be working alongside with other ROV. Both vehicles have their advantages and disadvantages. By working alongside, both vehicles can give more data and sight of a certain situation, for example, SAR operation.



Figure 1.1: Types of Underwater Vehicles. (a) Human Operated Vehicle (HOV) adapted from Atlantis submarines.travel (2017). (b) Remotely Operated Vehicle (ROV) adapted from Shipwrecks: Artifacts & Treasure (2017). (c) Autonomous Underwater Vehicle (AUV) adapted from Exercise, G. (2018). (d) Hybrid Remotely Operated Vehicle (HROV) adapted from MBARI (2017). (e) Underwater Remotely Operated Crawler (ROC) Adapted from Florida Tech eCurrent (2017).

For depth control of the ROV, an existence of overshoot in the system response is highly hazardous. Clearly, an overshoot in the ROV vertical trajectory may cause damages to both the ROV and the inspected structure. Maintaining the position of a small scale ROV

within its working area is difficult even for experienced ROV pilots, especially in the presence of underwater currents and waves (Aras and Abdullah, 2015). The operation of ROC also has the same problems in overshoot, rise time and settling time in the control system. Instead of vertical trajectory, ROC is operated on the x -axis and y -axis which is on the horizontal trajectory torque motors. Thus, this project focuses on controlling the ROC horizontal trajectory as the ROC tries to remain on the desired path and minimize its overshoot, rise time and settling time.

First of all, this project begins by creating an empirical modelling in order to capture the dynamics of the ROC by using system identification technique. From the modelling, an intelligent controller is implemented for yaw control of the ROC based on the Single Input Fuzzy Logic Controller (SIFLC). Later, the Improved SIFLC is designed to adapt the parameters depending on set point. The algorithm is then verified in MATLAB/Simulink platform to test the robustness of the controller' output responses. The results are verified that this technique can effectively control the horizontal path of the ROC with no overshoot including minimizing the settling time and the rise time.

1.2 Motivation

In this thesis, there are a few reasons that motivate to carry out the research. The reasons are outlined and justified based on information gathered from previous research on ROV and ROC. These statements explain the factors that affecting the manoeuvrability and navigating the underwater vehicles such as human factors, underwater environment, motion control system and the limitation of those vehicles.